UCLA Faculty Association

News and opinion from Dan Mitchell since 2009

Friday, August 1, 2025

Straws in the Wind - Part 57

From Inside Higher Ed: *A record number of American students applied to college or university in the United Kingdom for fall 2025, according to recent data from the Universities and Colleges Admissions Service (UCAS), the U.K.'s shared admission service. Some 7,930 U.S. undergraduates submitted applications, a year-over-year increase of nearly 14 percent. UCAS's data points to a trend among Americans who have expressed interest in emigrating after President Trump's reelection in November. Some young Americans have elected to leave the U.S. to pursue a graduate degree in response to the Trump administration and its policies.*

An exodus of domestic students to universities overseas could have negative consequences for already strapped institutions looking to recruit a shrinking undergraduate population...

Full story at https://www.insidehighered.com/news/quick-takes/2025/07/21/more-us-students-apply-uk-colleges-post-trump.

Posted by California Policy Issues at 3:20 AM No comments:

Labels: politics

Fund Suspension

From an email received Thursday evening, July 31, 2025:

Dear Bruin Community:

UCLA received a notice that the federal government, through its control of the National Science Foundation (NSF), the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and other agencies, is suspending certain research funding to UCLA. This is not only a loss to the researchers who rely on critical grants. It is a loss for Americans across the nation whose work, health, and future depend on the groundbreaking work we do.

To explain what I mean, I'd like to share a story. Thirteen years ago, Dr. Abbas Ardehali — a UCLA professor who leads groundbreaking research at the Heart and Lung Transplant Program in our Division of Cardiothoracic Surgery — changed the future of transplant medicine. He performed the first-ever lung transplant using the Organ Care System, a technology that keeps lungs breathing outside the body while they wait to be transplanted.

The Council of UC Faculty Associations

- Coalition of UC unions condemns Trump's attacks on the UC and the California economy
- Stand up for values in the face of Trump's $300 million cut to UCLA scholars
- Faculty leaders comment on UCB Chancellor Lyon's appearance before House Committee on Education and the Workforce
- CUCFA Opposes AB 715
- Pause Trellix and Form a Working Group to Explore Cybersecurity Solutions

Remaking the University

- The coalition of UC unions condemns Trump's attacks on the University of California and the Californian economy - 8/26/2025
- Liner Note 37. Chicago's Gift to Trump - 8/24/2025
- Liner Note 36. UCLA in the Extortion Machine - 8/10/2025

Higher Ed. News & Commentary

- Chronicle of Higher Education
- Inside Higher Education
- Remaking the University
- Changing Universities
- California Professor

Search This Blog

Search

UC Faculty Associations

- UCLA Faculty Association
- UCSB Faculty Association
- UCSC Faculty Association
- UCB Faculty Association
- Council of UC Faculty Associations

Other Faculty Organizations

- American Association of University Professors
- California Faculty Association (NEA)
- UC-AFT

Topics

politics (2122) UC (2024) UC Regents (1844) health care (1396) State Budget (1257) governor (1102) UC budget crisis (953) UC-Berkeley (887) diversity (853) pension (655) pensions (589) tuition (523) admissions (521) athletics (503) CSU (400) transportation (384) UC-Davis (373) online education (338) UCOP (302) uc retirement

Dr. Ardehali had a simple but radical belief: that we could save more lives if we stopped transporting organs on ice in drugstore coolers and instead kept them alive. He was right. Today, he and his team continue to push boundaries in transplant medicine research — not just preserving organs, but reviving and repairing them. That work is saving lives every day for ordinary Americans, veterans and our dedicated servicemembers.

And the first person to benefit from Dr. Ardehali's breakthrough? Not a well-connected diplomat or tycoon, but a local grandfather and carpenter — someone who helped build the very Ronald Reagan UCLA Medical Center where his life was saved.

This story captures so much of what UCLA stands for: life-changing research, driven by compassion and shared with the world. What we discover and create here — with the help and support of grants such as those from the NSF and NIH — doesn't just stay within the walls of our labs or lecture halls. It reaches real people and real lives across this nation, often in the most transformative ways.

Great universities are connective, forging links across disciplines and communities, bridging divides with empathy and insight. They are impactful, translating discoveries into action, and ideals into progress. UCLA is a *truly* great university, as evidenced by the connections we create and lives we improve — not just of those who study on our campus, but of people everywhere.

You can see that in so many parts of our research:

- Our planetary scientists, supported by the NSF and NASA, are searching for asteroids and other objects in space that could threaten Earth.
- Our Valley Fever Center, funded by the NIH, is working to better understand and treat the deadly invasive disease for which it is named.
- UCLA researchers helped create the Internet with support from the Department of Defense, and are now building new technologies that could fuel entire industries and help safeguard our soldiers.

This progress comes from a uniquely American idea: that public research universities, backed by federal support, can move our nation and all of civilization forward.

That is why the news we received is so deeply disappointing. With this decision, hundreds of grants may be lost, adversely affecting the lives and life-changing work of UCLA researchers, faculty and staff. In its notice to us, the federal government claims antisemitism and bias as the reasons. This far-reaching penalty of defunding life-saving research does *nothing* to address any alleged discrimination.

We share the goal of eradicating antisemitism across society. Antisemitism has no place on our campus, nor does any form of discrimination. We recognize that we can improve, and I am committed to doing so. Confronting the scourge of antisemitism effectively calls for thoughtfulness, commitment, and sustained effort — and UCLA has taken robust actions to make our campus a safe and welcoming environment for all students.

Earlier this year, we took concrete action by creating a new Office of Campus and Community Safety, instituting new policies to manage protests on campus, and taking decisive action for conduct that violates our policies.

We also launched an Initiative to Combat Antisemitism that is mobilizing our broad community to extinguish antisemitism completely and definitively. This is a standing initiative reporting directly to me.

As part of this initiative, UCLA is implementing recommendations of the Task Force to Combat Antisemitism and Anti-Israeli Bias. These include enhancing relevant training and education, improving the complaint system, ensuring enforcement of current and new laws and policies and cooperating with stakeholders.

These initiatives are deeply personal to me. My paternal grandparents left Germany in the 1930s with my father, who was 6 years old, and my aunt, who was 4. They were driven out of their home by an intolerable climate of antisemitism and hate. Members of my family who did not make that

(298) ucrp (298) audio (291) traffic (289) new hotel-conference center (282) UC enrollment (279) enrollment (255) UC-San Diego (250) community colleges (235) LAO (222) UC-Irvine (182) fund raising (164) UC-San Francisco (156) UC-Santa Barbara (155) UC-Santa Cruz (155) controller (145) faculty center (142) UC-Riverside (138) ballot propositions (132) CalPERS (121) UC-Merced (111) faculty pay (109) Master Plan (102) Yudof (90) UCRS retirement (62) Faculty Association at UCLA (59) parking (59) privatization (59) CalSTRS (50) UC Berkeley (34) copyright (31) campus climate survey (28) UCRS (21) Michigan Model (18) UC Merced (17) uc funding (16) State Contribution (14) UCOF (14) Regents (13) faculty recruitment (12) UC pay (7) graduate education (6) UC San Diego (5) UC Irvine (3) UCpolitics (3) teaching evaluation (3) UC Santa Cruz (2)

Blog Archive

▼ 2025 (722)
▼ September (4)
Minor Maybe - But Maybe Not
Straws in the Wind - Part 88
Will Harvard Continue to Lead the Charge? - Part 53
Lucky Me - Part 2
► August (115)
► July (101)
► June (96)
► May (85)
► April (81)
► March (83)
► February (76)
► January (81)
► 2024 (832)
► 2023 (828)
► 2022 (719)
► 2021 (710)
► 2020 (914)
► 2019 (671)
► 2018 (595)
► 2017 (666)
► 2016 (715)
► 2015 (765)
► 2014 (704)
► 2013 (776)
► 2012 (839)
► 2011 (738)
► 2010 (431)
► 2009 (12)

Contributors

- California Policy Issues
- Toby Higbie
- UCLA Faculty Association

decision perished. My wife is the daughter of a Holocaust survivor, whose family was murdered in the concentration camps.

That history is part of what drew me to UCLA. Our university was founded on the principle that everyone, no matter their background, deserves the freedom to learn and use that knowledge to make this world a better place. With the support of our government at all levels, UCLA's research, innovation and education does that every day, benefiting Americans across the nation.

Let me be clear: Federal research grants are not handouts. Our researchers compete fiercely for these grants, proposing work that the government itself deems vital to the country's health, safety and economic future. Grants lead to medical breakthroughs, economic advancement, improved national security and global competitiveness — these are national priorities.

UCLA has an obligation to ensure that the resources entrusted to us by society add maximum value back to society.

For the past several months, our leadership team has been preparing for this situation and have developed comprehensive contingency plans. We will do everything we can to protect the interests of faculty, students and staff — and to defend our values and principles. With the support of the UC Board of Regents and the UC Office of the President, we are actively evaluating our best course of action. We will be in constant communication as decisions move forward.

Our motto is *Fiat Lux*: Let there be light.

I see that light all around us: In the patient that Dr. Ardehali treated who got a second chance to hold his grandchildren, in the students who come from all walks of life with big dreams and bold ideas, in the quiet determination of researchers working late into the night on solutions that could change everything.

Fiat Lux isn't just a phrase on our seal. It is a promise — to keep shining light where it is needed most.

Much is at stake, but UCLA has faced defining moments before. And we have always met them with courage, resilience and resolve.

We are One UCLA.

Julio Frenk
Chancellor

Posted by California Policy Issues at 3:15 AM No comments:

Labels: diversity, politics, UCLA

The Memo

From Inside Higher Ed: *More than three months after a federal court struck down an Education Department directive that barred any practices that consider race at colleges across the country, the Department of Justice declared Wednesday that diversity, equity and inclusion practices are unlawful and "discriminatory." But the agency's memo goes even further than ED's guidance, suggesting that programs that rely on what they describe as stand-ins for race, like recruitment efforts that focus on majority-minority geographic areas, could violate federal civil rights laws. The directive applies to any organization that receives federal funds, and DOJ officials warned that engaging in potentially unlawful practices could lead to a loss in grant funding.*

Other examples of "potentially unlawful proxies" include requirements that job applicants "demonstrate 'cultural competence,' 'lived experience,' or 'cross-cultural skills'" or narratives about how the applicant has overcome obstacles, Attorney General Pamela Bondi wrote.

...Many of the practices declared unlawful in the nine-page memo echo those referenced in the Education Department's February Dear Colleague letter, such as race-based scholarships. But it also explicitly states that "BIPOC-only study lounges" and similar facilities are unlawful. The Education Department's guidance mentioned race-based facilities generally but not specifically study lounges...

The only truly safe ways to admit students right now are to admit everyone or only use standardized test scores," Robert Kelchen, a professor in the University of Tennessee at Knoxville's Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, wrote in an email to Inside Higher Ed...

Full story at https://www.insidehighered.com/news/government/2025/07/30/doj-declares-slew-dei-practices-unlawful-memo.

--

The full memo is at https://www.justice.gov/ag/media/1409486/dl. Executive summary below:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This guidance emphasizes the significant legal risks of initiatives that involve discrimination based on protected characteristics and provides non-binding best practices to help entities avoid the risk of violations. Key points include:

- *Statutory nondiscrimination requirements: Federal law prohibits discrimination based on protected characteristics like race, sex, color, national origin, or religion.*
- *Legal pitfalls of DEI Programs: The use of terms such as "DEI," "Equity," or other euphemistic terms does not excuse unlawful discrimination or absolve parties from scrutiny regarding potential violations.*
- *Prohibition on Protected Characteristics as Criteria: Using race, sex, or other protected characteristics for employment, program participation, resource allocation, or other similar activities, opportunities, or benefits, is unlawful, except in rare cases where such discrimination satisfies the relevant level of judicial scrutiny.*
- *Importance of Sex-separated Intimate Spaces and Athletic Competitions: Compelling employees to share intimate spaces with the opposite sex or allowing men to compete in women's athletic competitions would typically be unlawful.*
- *Unlawful Proxy Discrimination: Facially neutral criteria (e.g., "cultural competence," "lived experience," geographic targeting) that function as proxies for protected characteristics violate federal law if designed or applied with the intention of advantaging or disadvantaging individuals based on protected characteristics.*
- *Scrutiny of Third-Party Funding: Recipients of federal ñrnds should ensure federal funds do not support third-party programs that discriminate.*
- *Protection Against Retaliation: Individuals who object to or refuse to participate in discriminatory programs, trainings, or policies are protected from adverse actions like termination or exclusion based on that individual's opposition to those practices.*

Posted by California Policy Issues at 3:10 AM No comments:

Labels: admissions, diversity, politics

Thursday, July 31, 2025

Will Harvard Continue to Lead the Charge? - Part 40

From Bloomberg: *Harvard University said it would turn over employment forms for thousands of staff to comply with demands from the Department of Homeland Security. The federal inquiry applies to all current employees and any individual who worked for the university in the past year, Harvard said late Tuesday in a message to its community. Federal regulations entitle the government to review paperwork known as Form I-9 documents, which include information on employment eligibility. Harvard said it won't share records for students employed in roles only available to students and that it's evaluating whether such a request complies with privacy protection obligations.*

The DHS notice of inspection for the employment forms is separate from its earlier subpoenas seeking information on Harvard's international students... A Harvard spokesperson declined to comment beyond the message to university employees. What began as criticism over the university's handling of antisemitic incidents on campus has since morphed into a bigger standoff over accusations of political bias and criticism of diversity initiatives...

Full story at https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2025-07-29/harvard-will-comply-with-white-house-demands-for-employee-forms.

Posted by California Policy Issues at 3:35 AM No comments:

Labels: diversity, Harvard, politics

Who Should Pay How Much for What?

The Academic Council at the end of June wrote a letter to the systemwide VP of HR concerning upcoming increases in the cost of UC's health insurance plans for employees and retirees. These increases are expected to be large. So the question is how to allocate the increased costs among the plans offered by UC.

The systemwide Faculty Welfare and Health Care committees had advised the Council about the size of the increase and focused a lot of attention on the differential cost to participants between the HMO plans (especially Kaiser) and the UC Care option which offers more choice of providers. Decreasing the differential could lead to more participants migrating from the less costly HMO to the more costly UC Care. On the other hand, since it is believed that more healthy persons tend to choose the cheaper HMO and sicker people tend to choose UC Care, UC Care is potentially endangered by a "death spiral" such that at the margin the healthier segment of people in UC Care migrate to the HMO - thus increasing the cost per participant in UC Care and stimulating yet more migration.

To avoid a death spiral, the two advisory committees advised maintaining the differential between the HMO and UC Care.

When the Academic Council received the recommendations, it endorsed them. But it went further and added something not in the advisory letters: the role of retirees in the costs of the plans. Since retirees tend to be older - and thus have more health issues - their role would seem to be significant. However, it is important to note that most of the older retirees are under Medicare as the primary insurer. Hence, a significant chunk of their cost comes from Medicare.

It is unclear what caused the Academic Council to raise the retiree issue since it was not mentioned in the advisory letters. Below is the Academic Council's recommendation and the two advisory recommendations.

===

Academic Council

June 30, 2025

Cheryl Lloyd

Vice President, Systemwide Human Resources

Re: Setting 2026 Rates for University Employee Health and Welfare Benefits

Dear Vice President Lloyd,

On behalf of the Academic Council, I am forwarding the attached letter from the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW), which the Council endorsed at its June 25, 2025 meeting. The letter reflects the recommendations of both UCFW and its Health Care Task Force (HCTF) regarding potential health plan premium changes for 2026.

While the Council supports the recommendations, members expressed concern that the long-term sustainability of UC Care is in question. Council believes that a detailed analysis is urgently needed. Council is interested in a better understanding of the extent to which UC Care increases costs for employees enrolled in other plans, via internal subsidies. What would be most helpful is an analysis that evaluates not only the fiscal trajectory of UC Care but also models the impact on HMO plans if UC Care were no longer offered, including any redistribution of risk and resulting premium changes.

In addition, Council requests a clearer picture of retiree enrollment and cost patterns across available plans. This includes:

• The number of retirees enrolled in each plan,

• The cost of providing benefits to retirees as a proportion of total health expenditures, and

• The ability of the University to support retiree health benefits at historic levels in the current environment of escalating cost pressures.

We share the Senate committees' concerns about potential changes that may disproportionately impact lower-paid employees or undermine the equity and affordability of future health and benefits offerings. At the same time, we are mindful of the University's budget challenges and the need to preserve access and sustainability across all plan options.

Sincerely,

Steven W. Cheung

Chair, Academic Council

--

Enclosures (#1, #2)

--

cc: Academic Council, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Nava, Executive Vice President Rubin, Vice President and Chief of Staff Kao, Executive Director Jenkins, HCTF Chair Mays, Professor Richard Kronick, Senate Representative to the Executive Steering Committee on Health Benefits Programs, Senate Division Executive Directors, Senate Executive Director Lin

===

Enclosure #1

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

Juan Pablo Pardo-Guerra, Chair

June 23, 2025

Steve Cheung

Chair, Academic Council

Dear Chair Cheung,

The University Committee on Faculty Welfare, upon advice from its Health Care Task Force ("HCTF"), asks Academic Council to endorse and convey the attached recommendations concerning changes to the health plans offered by the University of California ("UC"). Proposed approaches to determine employer and employee contributions to the health plans offered by UC generated concern among experts of HCTF and UCFW at large. UCFW agrees with HCTF in the urgency of conveying these concerns to leadership in Human Resources and the Executive Advisory Steering Committee.

UCFW agrees with HCTF's recommendation that the University increase its health insurance contributions by at least the same percentage as the average premium hike. For example, if premiums go up by 10.5%, a matching increase from the University would still leave employees paying more. Anything less than that, such as an 8.5% increase, would result in employees facing a disproportionate rise in their share—potentially over 20%.

While we agree that UC Care should be kept financially stable, we oppose changes that would significantly reduce the differential in employee premium contributions for UC Care compared to Blue and Gold. We understand that HR is considering making the difference between UC Care and Blue and Gold in employee premiums much smaller in 2026 than it was in 2025. Narrowing that gap could encourage employees to choose a more expensive care option, which may not be in the University's best interest.

Reducing the differential undermines current incentives and could lead to increased overall health care costs.

UCFW is also especially concerned with changes that reduce the premium gap between Kaiser and Blue & Gold, since 42% of employees are enrolled in Kaiser. Plans to lower the University's contribution to Kaiser would shift more costs to employees, particularly those in lower pay bands, and unfairly penalize a large portion of the workforce. We urge holding off on any major changes for 2026 until a broader review of pay band contribution policy is completed for 2027.

UCFW and HCTF have a long and established record of working with the administration in shaping the health benefits for UC employees. Some key features of UC's approach to benefits are the direct result of HCTF's efforts. Given this record, we hope that HCTF's recommendations will continue to shape the design of health benefits going forward.

Sincerely,

Juan Pablo Pardo-Guerra, Chair

UCFW

Cc: Ahmet Palazoglu, Academic Council Vice Chair, Monica Lin, Systemwide Academic Senate Executive Director, Juan Pablo Pardo Guerra, UCFW Chair

===

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

HEALTH CARE TASK FORCE

Vickie Mays, Chair

June 23, 2025

Juan Pablo Pardo-Guerra

Chair, University Committee on Faculty Welfare

RE: Setting Rates for Health and Welfare Benefits, FY 2026

Dear Chair Pardo-Guerra,

The UCFW Health Care Task Force (HCTF) continues working closely with systemwide Human Resources (HR) and its consultant Mercer on the methods and approaches to be used in setting the 2026 employer and employee contributions to the UC health and welfare plan offerings. HR will make decisions at the end of July following advice from the Executive Advisory Steering Committee (EASC), which is scheduled to meet on July 28. Much work has taken place between HCTF and HR/Mercer, and while some changes were made to the original plans, we strongly feel that now is the time for the Academic Senate to strongly convey our concerns about the final proposal that HR appears to be moving towards. As a decision will be made in the very near future, HCTF is requesting that the Academic Council, through Chair Cheung, convey our concerns to Cheryl Lloyd, Vice President, Systemwide Human Resources and Chief Human Resources Officer and to Maynard Jenkins, Senior Executive Director, Benefits Programs & Strategy, Systemwide Human Resources. Most importantly our concerns, which are summarized in the 5 bullet points below, should be copied to the members of the EASC who will play a significant advisory role in the decision-making. The Academic Senate is represented on the EASC by Rick Kronick (UCSD) Distinguished Professor, who is also a member of HCTF. Other members of the EASC are Rachel Nava, Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer; Nathan Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer; David Rubin, Executive Vice President for UC Health; and Jenny Kao, Vice President & Chief of Staff to the UC President.

HCTF recommends:

1. We strongly urge that the University contribution to health insurance increase by at least the amount of the average premium increase. If the average premium increase is 10.5%, even a 10.5% increase in the University contribution will leave employees with a 10.5% increase in the employee share of the premium. An 8.5% increase in the University contribution would cause the employee paid premium contributions to increase by more than 20%.

2. We support the motivation to keep UC Care from entering a 'death spiral', but we oppose changes that would significantly reduce the differential in employee premium contributions for UC Care compared to Blue and Gold. We understand that HR is considering making the difference between UC Care and Blue and Gold in employee premiums much smaller in 2026 than it was in 2025. We think this is a mistake because we do not think that UC should be providing stronger financial incentives than in the status quo for employees to choose a more expensive method of delivering medical care.

3. Even more strongly, we oppose any changes that would significantly reduce the differential between what employees pay for Kaiser and what they pay for Blue and Gold, both of which are HMOs. Approximately 42% of employees choose Kaiser. In one scenario, the University contribution to Kaiser would be approximately 25% less than the University contribution for Blue and Gold in 2026, causing the difference in employee premium contributions between Kaiser and Blue and Gold to narrow by about $40 (for individual coverage) to about $120/month (for full family coverage) in pay band 1 relative to 2025. We think it would be a bad approach to increase the employee premium contribution for Kaiser by more than the corresponding increase for Blue and Gold. Such a change would unfairly disadvantage the 42% of employees who choose Kaiser, and, over time, cause more employees to choose Blue and Gold, which will increase health benefit costs for the University.

4. We understand that HR is planning a comprehensive review of how the University sets contribution levels across pay bands for 2027, and we support the desirability of this review. We understand also that HR is considering changes for 2026 that could result in larger increases in employee contributions in pay bands 1 (under $70,001) and 2 ($71,001-$140,000), and smaller increases in pay bands 3 and 4. We think it is premature to implement any substantial changes in 2026, and encourage waiting until the results of the more comprehensive review is conducted for 2027. We are particularly concerned about potential changes that would result in substantial increases in the premium contributions that employees in pay bands 1 and 2 would be required to pay for Kaiser, which is the largest enrollment plan in those pay bands.

5. We strongly urge UC Health to provide a larger 'friends and family' discount for UC employees and their families. 2026 will be an extremely challenging year for everyone at UC, and we know that the challenges extend to the UC Medical Centers. However, we think that the Medical Centers can and should contribute to the solution to the problem created by health care premiums that are increasing much faster than the rest of the University budget and much faster than employee wages. We also strongly encourage UC Health to provide credible data on the size of the 'friends and family' discount.

Thank you for helping to advance our shared goals in this important area.

Sincerely,

Vickie Mays, Chair HCTF

Cc: Steve Cheung, Academic Council Chair, Ahmet Palazoglu, Academic Council Vice Chair, Monica Lin, Systemwide Academic Senate Executive Director

===

Source: https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/reports/council-vphr-rates-for-health-and-welfare-benefits.pdf.

Posted by California Policy Issues at 3:30 AM No comments:

Labels: health care, UC, uc retirement

Straws in the Wind - Part 56

From Stat: *Long before she became president of the University of Minnesota, Rebecca Cunningham trained in emergency medicine. She draws on that experience often these days...*

You proposed a $5.1 billion budget for the university, which the board approved. The budget allows for merit raises, but it also raises tuition and calls for a 7% cut to academic programs. How did you settle on that budget?

To move ahead strategically, you need to double down on your strengths and invest, but this is also a time of resource constraints with federal funding reductions. We [also] have a flat state budget this year, and a flat budget is a reduction of 3%, essentially, with inflation. We made the decision this year, like many universities did, to take a hard look at areas where we could indeed trim some, and we did that specifically with the focus of being able to then invest in our people, in our workforce, and invest in our operations and buildings moving forward, and our infrastructure.

The Trump administration has terminated grants for studying vaccine hesitancy, health disparities, and other topics. How are you supporting affected researchers?

We have about 100 grants that have been stopped, and about $40-plus million of funding. The difficulty with that really is the suddenness at which it happens and the inability to plan. We're trying to address that issue specifically in using some university funds that are modest, with some donor support. Instead of having a [sudden] stoppage of their labs and firing of all their people, [we] try to give [faculty] some funds for a respectful ramp down over more months so

that we can fully try to gain and utilize at least some portion of the data and not lose the workforce of postdocs, grad students, and junior faculty that are on those grants, so that we can help them transition to areas then that may have more funding.

Despite those efforts, have there been layoffs?

Absolutely. You can't lose $40 million in grants without layoffs and terminations. And just this past week, we had SNAP-Ed [Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Education] terminated across the country. University of Minnesota Extension administered that program in all 87 counties, helping to provide education around food assistance to predominantly rural Minnesotans. That program was ended, and we laid off 80 people. So that is not one that we are able to continue, and that will be felt in the communities directly...

Full story at https://www.statnews.com/2025/07/21/university-minnesota-president-rebecca-cunningham-q-and-a/.

From the NY Times: *The Trump administration has frozen $108 million in federal funds for Duke University's medical school and health care system, according to two administration officials, after the government accused the university of "systemic racial discrimination." Duke University is the latest high-profile school, from Columbia University to Harvard, that the Trump administration has targeted and stripped of a large amount of federal funding, based on vague accusations that the university abets antisemitism or supports diversity, equity and inclusion programs. The move comes amid a wider pressure campaign from the Trump administration to shift the ideological tilt of American higher education.*

Robert F. Kennedy Jr., the health secretary, and Linda McMahon, the education secretary, sent a letter to Duke administrators on Monday expressing concerns about "racial preferences in hiring, student admissions, governance, patient care, and other operations" in the university's health care system.

In the letter, the officials accused Duke of violating Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, which prohibits discrimination based on race and nationality in programs receiving federal funding. Mr. Kennedy and Ms. McMahon called on Duke Health, the university's health care system, to review all policies "for the illegal use of race preferences" and to create a "Merit and Civil Rights Committee" that would work with the federal government. The $108 million cut could be permanent, if the government concludes the university violated the Civil Rights Act...

Full story at https://www.nytimes.com/2025/07/29/us/politics/trump-duke-university-frozen-funding-discrimination.html.

Posted by California Policy Issues at 3:20 AM No comments:

Labels: Columbia, diversity, Duke, Harvard, politics, U of Minnesota

Wednesday, July 30, 2025

New Case

From the LA Times: *The Department of Justice said Tuesday that UCLA violated the civil rights of Jewish and Israeli students who reported harassment and intimidation during a spring 2024 pro-Palestinian campus encampment, heightening the political tensions between the University of California and the Trump administration. In a letter addressed to UC President Michael V. Drake, DOJ officials said, "Jewish and Israeli students at UCLA were subjected to severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive harassment that created a hostile environment by members of the encampment."*

The letter faulted UCLA for not taking down the encampment until after it was attacked by a pro-Israel group. In addition, the department found UCLA was "inadequate" in its response to complaints from Jewish and Israeli students last spring, violating the Equal Protection Clause and Title VI. A DOJ statement that said UCLA acted with "deliberate indifference" toward Jewish students and Atty. Gen. Pam Bondi said the Trump administration will make UCLA pay a "heavy price." ...

Full story at https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2025-07-29/ucla-settles-lawsuit-jewish-students.

News release from DOJ at:

https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/justice-department-finds-university-california-los-angeles-violation-federal-civil-rights.

The full letter from DOJ to UC President Drake is at:

https://ia600402.us.archive.org/9/items/2-final-hjaa-report.-the-soil-beneath-the-encampments/UCLA%20DOJ%20Letter%20to%20UCLA%20on%20Notice%20of%20Findings%207-29-2025.pdf.

Posted by California Policy Issues at 7:50 AM No comments:

Labels: diversity, Drake, politics, UC, UCLA

Newer Posts Home Older Posts

Subscribe to: Posts (Atom)

Simple theme. Powered by Blogger.